



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,792	02/14/2001	Keiji Sakata	36856.449	9594

7590 10/09/2002
Keating & Bennett LLP
Suite 312
10400 Eaton Place
Fairfax, VA 22030

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TUYEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2832

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/782,792

Applicant(s)
Sakata

Examiner
Tuyen T. Nguyen

Art Unit
2832



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 30, 2002
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2832

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meadors et al. [US 6,249,205] in view of Patel et al. [US 6,429,763].

Meadors et al. discloses a multi-layer inductor [see previous office action, paragraph 6].

Meadors et al. discloses the instant claimed invention except for each coil conductor pattern on the main surface of the plurality of the magnetic layers is in a range of about 35% to about 75% of the area of the main surface of the respective ones of the plurality of magnetic layers.

Patel et al. discloses a multi-layer inductor [figure 9] comprising:

- a plurality of *substantially* disk-shaped layers [figures 1-9];
- a plurality of coil conductor patterns formed on the plurality of layers, respectively,

wherein the coil conductor pattern on the main surface the plurality of the layers is in a range of about 35% to about 75% of the area of the main surface of the respective ones of the plurality of layers.

Art Unit: 2832

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the coil conductor pattern design of Patel et al. in Meadors et al. for the purpose of improving usage of the area of the conductive material and minimizing leakage inductance.

The specific width of the coil conductor patterns would have been an obvious design consideration based on the desired inductance.

3. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meadors et al. in view of Patel et al. as applied to claims 1-5 above, and further in view of Gu et al. [US 5,499,005].

Meadors et al. in view of Patel et al. discloses the instant claimed invention except for the specific shape of the coil conductor patterns.

Gu et al. discloses the use of C-shaped or ring-shaped coil conductor patterns [see figures 1-2] in a multi-layer inductor.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the coil conductor pattern shape design of Gu et al. for the coil conductor patterns of Meadors et al., as modified, for the purpose of facilitating manufacturing and optimizing the inductance [see column 3, lines 49-55].

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2832

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Tuyen T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-0821.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Elvin Enad, can be reached at (703) 308-7619. The fax number for this Group is (703)872-9318 before the final office action, if the response is after final office action the fax number is (703)872-9319.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to status of this application of proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

TTN TTN

October 7, 2002

Tuyen T. Nguyen